



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO. 99/244,384	FILING DATE 02/03/99	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR BEACH	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. EN998871
-------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

SHELLEY M BECKSTRAND
314 MAIN STREET
OWEGO NY 13827

LM02/0302

EXAMINER CHUNG, C

ART UNIT 2764	PAPER NUMBER 3
------------------	-------------------

DATE MAILED: 03/02/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/244,304

Applicant(s)

Beach et al

Examiner
Chang Y. Chung

Group Art Unit
2764



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Feb 3, 1999

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☒ The drawing(s) filed on Feb 3, 1999 is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 2

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 2764

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-9 have been examined.

Drawings

2. Drawings are objected to for the reasons set forth in form PTO 948.
3. Applicant is required to submit a proposed drawing correction in reply to this Office action. However, formal correction of the noted defect can be deferred until the application is allowed by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

Art Unit: 2764

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klein (US 5,845,285) in view of Geer (US 5,930,778).

As per claim 1, Klein discloses a method for operating a computing system, comprising the steps of:

processing electronic invoices received from a vendor to identify duplicate invoices (abstract, column 5, particularly lines 55-65, column 6, particularly lines 1-5);

introducing data (invoices) not identified as duplicates into a system (column 26, particularly lines 32-36); and

rejecting data (invoices) identified as duplicates without introducing the data into the system (column 26, particularly lines 38-43).

Klein does not explicitly teach preprocessing of invoices. However, Geer discloses preprocessing of invoices (abstract, column 6, particularly lines 43-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention to use method of duplicate invoice identification of Klein in preprocessing of invoices of Geer because this would allow duplicate data to be sorted out as soon as possible.

Klein does not explicitly teach introduction to and rejection from a accounts payable data base. However, Klein does suggest this feature by disclosing correction of the system (column 26, particularly lines 40-44) and filtering database (column 27, particularly lines 22-25).

Art Unit: 2764

Further, accounts payable data base is deemed to be inherent in Klein's description of invoicing system (column 5, particularly lines 46-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention to introduce and reject data from an accounts payable database because this would allow filtering and sorting out to be implemented as soon as data is available.

As per claim 2, Klein discloses a method for operating a computing system, comprising the steps of:

auditing invoice file for a duplicate invoice item (abstract, column 5, particularly lines 55-65, column 6, particularly lines 1-5);

upon determining data is a duplicate, creating a duplicate data transaction (column 26, particularly lines 37-43); and

posting to the system only data determined not to be duplicate (column 26, particularly lines 32-36).

Klein does not explicitly teach grabbing an inbound EDI invoice file from a vendor before it is input to a accounts payable database and creating a transaction to a vendor. However, official notice is taken that it is old and well known in the art of data entry to grab data before input into a database for the purpose of examination for error. Further, official notice is taken that it is old and well known in the art of electronic communication and commerce to use EDI for invoicing. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants'

Art Unit: 2764

invention to grab an inbound EDI invoice data before inputting it into a database because this would allow detection of duplicate as soon as possible.

Klein does not explicitly teach creating transaction back to the vendor. However, Klein suggests this feature by disclosing a warning report system (column 26, particularly lines 38-43). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention to create a transaction back to the vendor because this would allow the vendor to be informed of the mistake and take corrective actions.

As per claim 3, Klein discloses auditing step comprising sorting invoices against invoice number (column 6, particularly lines 8-10).

Klein does not explicitly teach auditing step comprising first sorting invoice against an accounts payable production table for same vendor, second sorting hits from said first sorting for same purchase order billed, third sorting hits from second sorting for same items billed on purchase order, and fourth sorting hits from third sorting to identify invoice as duplicate invoice if it contains an item having a net sum greater than zero. However, Klein does discuss using neural network (column 27, particularly lines 54-65) that executes multiple comparing and sorting hits (column 28, particularly lines 28-41), and identifying data as duplicate if it does not pass a threshold number of hits (column 28, particularly lines 44-45). This suggests sorting of invoice for same vendor, purchase order billed, and items billed, since they are essential for identifying duplicates. Further Klein also discuss threshold value, term to describe the function of the "net sum greater than zero" of applicants' invention. It would have been obvious to one of

Art Unit: 2764

ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention to use invoice for same vendor, purchase order billed, and items billed as entries that are used in neural network comparing and sorting method of Klein because those entry values are essential for determining duplicate data. Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention to use zero as the threshold value disclosed in Klein because this would allow maximum detection of duplicates.

As per claim 4, Klein discloses a method for operating a computing system responsive to receipt of an electronic input (abstract).

Klein discloses identifying previously received invoices having the same vendor invoice identifier (column 6, particularly lines 8-10).

Klein does not explicitly teach grabbing an invoice from a vendor before it is input to a accounts payable database and creating a transaction to a vendor. However, official notice is taken that it is old and well known in the art of data entry to grab data before input into a database for the purpose of examination for error. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention to grab an invoice data before inputting it into a database because this would allow detection of duplicate as soon as possible.

Further, Klein does not explicitly teach identifying invoices having corresponding items, and calculating the net sum of items on input invoice having corresponding items. However, Klein does discuss using neural network (column 27, particularly lines 54-65) that executes multiple comparing and sorting hits (column 28, particularly lines 28-41), and identifying data as

Art Unit: 2764

duplicate if it does not pass a threshold number of hits (column 28, particularly lines 44-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention to use item as a comparison factor in Klein's system because type of item is essential in determining duplicates. Further, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention to calculating the net sum of items to determine if the data is duplicate since this would utilize Klein's threshold value.

Klein does not explicitly teach communicating a duplicate invoice rejection message back to the vendor. However, Klein suggests this feature by disclosing a warning report system (column 26, particularly lines 38-43). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention to communicate a duplicate invoice rejection message back to the vendor because this would allow the vendor to be informed of the mistake and take corrective actions.

Klein discloses posting to the system data determined not to be duplicate (column 26, particularly lines 32-36).

As per claim 5, Klein discloses a program storage device readable by a machine, tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by a machine to perform method steps for processing electronic input (abstract), said method step comprising:

processing electronic invoices received from a vendor to identify duplicate invoices (abstract, column 5, particularly lines 55-65, column 6, particularly lines 1-5);

Art Unit: 2764

introducing data (invoices) not identified as duplicates into a system (column 26, particularly lines 32-36); and

rejecting data (invoices) identified as duplicates without introducing the data into the system (column 26, particularly lines 38-43).

Klein does not explicitly teach preprocessing of invoices. However, Geer discloses preprocessing of invoices (abstract, column 6, particularly lines 43-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention to use method of duplicate invoice identification of Klein in preprocessing of invoices of Geer because this would allow duplicate data to be sorted out as soon as possible.

Klein does not explicitly teach introduction to and rejection from a accounts payable data base. However, Klein does suggest this feature by disclosing correction of the system (column 26, particularly lines 40-44) and filtering database (column 27, particularly lines 22-25). Further, accounts payable data base is deemed to be inherent in Klein's description of invoicing system (column 5, particularly lines 46-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention to introduce and reject data from an accounts payable database because this would allow filtering and sorting out to be implemented as soon as data is available.

As per claim 6, Klein discloses a program storage device readable by a machine, tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by a machine to perform method steps for processing electronic input (abstract).

Art Unit: 2764

Klein discloses identifying previously received invoices having the same vendor invoice identifier (column 6, particularly lines 8-10).

Klein does not explicitly teach grabbing an invoice from a vendor before it is input to a accounts payable database and creating a transaction to a vendor. However, official notice is taken that it is old and well known in the art of data entry to grab data before input into a database for the purpose of examination for error. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention to grab an invoice data before inputting it into a database because this would allow detection of duplicate as soon as possible.

Further, Klein does not explicitly teach identifying invoices having corresponding items, and calculating the net sum of items on input invoice having corresponding items. However, Klein does discuss using neural network (column 27, particularly lines 54-65) that executes multiple comparing and sorting hits (column 28, particularly lines 28-41), and identifying data as duplicate if it does not pass a threshold number of hits (column 28, particularly lines 44-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention to use item as a comparison factor in Klein's system because type of item is essential in determining duplicates. Further, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention to calculating the net sum of items to determine if the data is duplicate since this would utilize Klein's threshold value.

Klein does not explicitly teach communicating a duplicate invoice rejection message back to the vendor. However, Klein suggests this feature by disclosing a warning report system

Art Unit: 2764

(column 26, particularly lines 38-43). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention to communicate a duplicate invoice rejection message back to the vendor because this would allow the vendor to be informed of the mistake and take corrective actions.

Klein discloses posting to the system data determined not to be duplicate (column 26, particularly lines 32-36).

As per claim 7, Klein discloses an article of manufacture comprising a computer useable medium having program code means (abstract).

Klein discloses identifying previously received invoices having the same vendor invoice identifier (column 6, particularly lines 8-10).

Klein does not explicitly teach grabbing an invoice from a vendor before it is input to a accounts payable database and creating a transaction to a vendor. However, official notice is taken that it is old and well known in the art of data entry to grab data before input into a database for the purpose of examination for error. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention to grab an invoice data before inputting it into a database because this would allow detection of duplicate as soon as possible.

Further, Klein does not explicitly teach identifying invoices having corresponding items, and calculating the net sum of items on input invoice having corresponding items. However, Klein does discuss using neural network (column 27, particularly lines 54-65) that executes multiple comparing and sorting hits (column 28, particularly lines 28-41), and identifying data as

Art Unit: 2764

duplicate if it does not pass a threshold number of hits (column 28, particularly lines 44-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention to use item as a comparison factor in Klein's system because type of item is essential in determining duplicates. Further, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention to calculating the net sum of items to determine if the data is duplicate since this would utilize Klein's threshold value.

Klein does not explicitly teach communicating a duplicate invoice rejection message back to the vendor. However, Klein suggests this feature by disclosing a warning report system (column 26, particularly lines 38-43). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention to communicate a duplicate invoice rejection message back to the vendor because this would allow the vendor to be informed of the mistake and take corrective actions.

Klein discloses posting to the system data determined not to be duplicate (column 26, particularly lines 32-36).

As per claim 8, Klein discloses an article of manufacture comprising a computer readable medium having computer readable program code means (abstract).

Klein discloses computer readable code means for:

processing electronic invoices received from a vendor to identify duplicate invoices (abstract, column 5, particularly lines 55-65, column 6, particularly lines 1-5);

Art Unit: 2764

introducing data (invoices) not identified as duplicates into a system (column 26, particularly lines 32-36); and

rejecting data (invoices) identified as duplicates without introducing the data into the system (column 26, particularly lines 38-43).

Klein does not explicitly teach preprocessing of invoices. However, Geer discloses preprocessing of invoices (abstract, column 6, particularly lines 43-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention to use method of duplicate invoice identification of Klein in preprocessing of invoices of Geer because this would allow duplicate data to be sorted out as soon as possible.

Klein does not explicitly teach introduction to and rejection from a accounts payable data base. However, Klein does suggest this feature by disclosing correction of the system (column 26, particularly lines 40-44) and filtering database (column 27, particularly lines 22-25). Further, accounts payable data base is deemed to be inherent in Klein's description of invoicing system (column 5, particularly lines 46-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention to introduce and reject data from an accounts payable database because this would allow filtering and sorting out to be implemented as soon as data is available.

As per claim 9, Klein discloses a computing system responsive to receipt of an electronic input (abstract).

Art Unit: 2764

Klein discloses identifying previously received invoices having the same vendor invoice identifier (column 6, particularly lines 8-10).

Klein does not explicitly teach grabbing an invoice from a vendor before it is input to a accounts payable database and creating a transaction to a vendor. However, official notice is taken that it is old and well known in the art of data entry to grab data before input into a database for the purpose of examination for error. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention to grab an invoice data before inputting it into a database because this would allow detection of duplicate as soon as possible.

Further, Klein does not explicitly teach identifying invoices having corresponding items, and calculating the net sum of items on input invoice having corresponding items. However, Klein does discuss using neural network (column 27, particularly lines 54-65) that executes multiple comparing and sorting hits (column 28, particularly lines 28-41), and identifying data as duplicate if it does not pass a threshold number of hits (column 28, particularly lines 44-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention to use item as a comparison factor in Klein's system because type of item is essential in determining duplicates. Further, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention to calculating the net sum of items to determine if the data is duplicate since this would utilize Klein's threshold value.

Klein does not explicitly teach communicating a duplicate invoice rejection message back to the vendor. However, Klein suggests this feature by disclosing a warning report system

Art Unit: 2764

(column 26, particularly lines 38-43). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention to communicate a duplicate invoice rejection message back to the vendor because this would allow the vendor to be informed of the mistake and take corrective actions.

Klein discloses posting to the system data determined not to be duplicate (column 26, particularly lines 32-36).

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Plant-Mason et al (US 5,675,780) discloses a method and apparatus for storing data in database form to a compact disc using a script file to describe the input format of data.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chang Y. Chung whose telephone number is (703) 308-6280. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:30 AM - 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James P. Trammell, can be reached on (703) 305-9768.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
c/o Technology Center 2700

Art Unit: 2764

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051 (for formal communications intended for entry)


or:

(703) 308-5397 (for informal or draft communications, please label

"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding
should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.


Chang Y. Chung
February 23, 2000


James F. Trammett
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2700